

5-27-1932

## City Club of Portland Bulletin vol. 13, no. 04 (1932-5-27)

City Club of Portland (Portland, Or.)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: [http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl\\_cityclub](http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_cityclub)



Part of the [Urban Studies Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

City Club of Portland (Portland, Or.), "City Club of Portland Bulletin vol. 13, no. 04 (1932-5-27)" (1932). *City Club of Portland*. Paper 86.

[http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl\\_cityclub/86](http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_cityclub/86)

This Bulletin is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in City Club of Portland by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).

"Harmony in  
Diversity"

# PORTLAND CITY CLUB BULLETIN

"Active  
Citizenship"

VOLUME XIII

PORTLAND, OREGON, DECEMBER 23, 1932

NUMBER 34

**FRIDAY, DECEMBER 23**

**HOTEL BENSON; 12:10**

## **Annual Christmas Meeting**

LADIES ARE INVITED

SPEAKER

**THE REVEREND W. G. ELIOT, JR.**

*Pastor, Church of Our Father*

### **Special Christmas Music**

MRS. HERMAN T. BOHLMAN . . . . . *Soprano*  
MRS. MADELINE DWYER . . . . . *Contralto*

## **THE JUVENILE COURT OF MULTNOMAH COUNTY**

*A Report by the Social Welfare and Public Safety and Defense Sections*

	PAGE
I.—PURPOSE AND GROWTH OF THE JUVENILE COURT.....	1
II.—MULTNOMAH COUNTY JUVENILE COURT.....	2
A.—JURISDICTION.....	2
1.—HISTORY OF LEGISLATION.....	2
2.—FEDERAL LAW REGARDING JUVENILE CASES.....	5
3.—JURISDICTION AS TO TYPE OF JUVENILE MISBEHAVIOR.....	5
4.—RECOMMENDED CHANGES IN THE LAW.....	5
B.—PERSONNEL.....	6
1.—JUDGE.....	6
2.—PROBATION OFFICERS.....	7
C.—PROCEDURE.....	8
1.—SOURCE OF COMPLAINT.....	8
2.—DETENTION.....	8
3.—MEDICAL AND PSYCHIATRIC CARE.....	9
4.—HEARINGS.....	10
5.—DISPOSITION OF CASE.....	11
D.—STATISTICAL DATA.....	11
III.—CONCLUSIONS.....	12

To the Board of Governors of the City Club:

Your committee appointed by the joint section of Public Safety and Defense and Social Welfare to study and report on the Multnomah County Juvenile Court and its functions within the county, after extensive investigation and study submits the following report:

### **I.—PURPOSE AND GROWTH OF THE JUVENILE COURT**

#### **A.—PURPOSE.**

Law has been long recognized as the means by which society endeavors to regulate itself and its component members. But through the

ages, the law has only regarded the vindictives of punishment for wrongful acts irrespective of the deep, sociological causes back of such acts. When treating with hardened criminals, this legal weapon was partially successful when it separated the criminal from society and so relieved society of the danger of physical contact with the confirmed criminal.

But the foundation of society is the family. Society progresses only as the standard of life and morals is raised for the benefit of the coming generations. The endeavor is constantly to protect the child from all contacts that will or might demoralize his life. So law must be considered as a safeguard for the home and the

# PORTLAND CITY CLUB BULLETIN

Published Weekly by

## THE CITY CLUB

OF PORTLAND

Office of the Club . . . . . 606 Oregon Building

Telephone ATwater 6593

Subscription Price . . . . . \$1.00 per year

Entered as Second Class Matter, October 29, 1920, at the postoffice at Portland, Oregon, under act of March 3, 1879.

City Club dues are \$1.00 per month, payable semi-annually on May 1st, and November 1st. There is no initiation fee.

The regular Friday luncheon meetings are held in the Crystal Room of the Benson Hotel.

### CITY CLUB PURPOSE

*"To inform its members and the community in public matters and to arouse them to a realization of the obligations of citizenship."*

### THE CITY CLUB BOARD OF GOVERNORS

RICHARD W. MONTAGUE . . . . .	President
WILLIAM C. McCULLOCH . . . . .	First Vice-President
M. D. WELLS . . . . .	Second Vice-President
THORNTON T. MUNGER . . . . .	Secretary
R. E. KOON . . . . .	Treasurer

CHARLES MCKINLEY  
LLOYD J. WENTWORTH  
STUART R. STRONG  
W. S. U'REN  
JAMES A. MCKINNON  
WILLIS K. CLARK

RUSSELL W. BARTHELL . . . . . Executive Secretary

child. When the law-makers began to recognize this premise for all laws, the sociological spirit of jurisprudence was born. As H. H. Lou in his "Juvenile Courts in the United States" states, "We are realizing more and more that law should be conceived as a means towards social ends. This new conception of law compels us to take account of social causes and social effects in relation to social conditions and social progress."

Along with this changed conception has arisen a realization that if reformation is to replace vengeance in our law enforcement, the cause of crime must be attacked. The majority of crimes are adult developments of dependent and delinquent conditions arising in childhood. If the turbulent stream of crime is to be checked, this control must be at its fountain, youth. Reformation of wayward youth, if accomplished at all, must be by education and probation during childhood. It is impossible to do this with the hindrance of rigid laws and form-bound courts established on principles of punishment alone. The natural development of this new conception has been threefold: first, separation of child and

adult cases; second, investigation and probation of child cases; and third, independent laws and courts to deal with juvenile cases. The founding of the juvenile court as a separate and distinct entity is the result of this growth in thought.

### B.—GROWTH.

#### 1.—IN THE UNITED STATES.

The Juvenile Court is an idea realized within the last thirty years. Whereas its birth is recent, its conception in the fertile minds of pioneer modern sociologists was first evidenced in child laws of detention and probation dating back more than a century before.

The earliest child legislation along modern lines in the United States occurred in 1825 in New York State when a house of refuge was founded to care for dependent children. Similar institutions followed in 1828 in Pennsylvania and in 1829 in Massachusetts. The law did not take cognizance of the sociological differences in the handling of adult and juvenile cases until 1869. Massachusetts was the leader at that time. An act was passed requiring that an officer of the State Board of Charity be present at all trials involving a juvenile. Later, in 1877, in the same state, another act provided for separate trial, records and dockets in all juvenile cases.

Probation was the next step and Massachusetts in 1880 again led the way by establishing a probation system for the reformation of juvenile delinquents. Illinois now became the leader in juvenile work. In 1867, a separate judge was designated to hear juvenile cases and in 1899, the first juvenile court in the world was established in Chicago, Illinois, as the result of ten years of hard pioneer work. The step once taken continued with accelerated motion. Denver, Colorado, was second in 1903. By the end of 1904, ten states had adopted the juvenile court laws, including our neighbor state, California; by 1914, 31 states had such laws; by 1920, 45 states and 3 territories had established them, and by 1928 all states and territories except Wyoming had established the juvenile court system within their limits.

#### 2.—IN THE WORLD.

America may be proud of the fact that she has led the way in the establishment of this modern branch of jurisprudence. It was not until 1908 that Great Britain and Canada organized such courts. Switzerland followed in 1920, France and Belgium in 1912, and Hungary in 1913. Then came the Great War, with destruction paramount to advancement. The war over, progress continued and, in 1919, Argentine and Austria adopted the step. Holland and Japan followed in 1922 and Germany and Brazil in 1923, with Spain following in 1924.

#### 3.—IN OREGON.

Oregon was one of the pioneers in juvenile court work in that it established its court in 1905. This was only six years after the original court was established in Chicago. The legislative growth of the Court follows.

## II.—MULTNOMAH COUNTY JUVENILE COURT

### A.—JURISDICTION.

#### 1.—HISTORY OF LEGISLATION.

##### a.—In General.

The salient features and provisions of the 1905 Act and ensuing acts relating to the juvenile

court in Oregon are summarized below. This is done to illustrate the origin and growth of the juvenile laws and to aid the reader in the better understanding of their present status and their needed changes.

*b.—Act of 1905.*

The original Juvenile Court Act set the jurisdictional age limit of juveniles at sixteen years. The circuit courts of the state were invested with such jurisdiction over juvenile delinquents and dependents. Provision was made for jury trials by a jury of six in all proceedings arising under the juvenile laws upon the demand of any interested party or upon the motion of the judge of the court. This very improper and undesirable provision was not repealed until 1919, when it was provided that jury trials should be permissible only in the case of criminal proceedings originating under the juvenile laws. This act also increased the number of jurors from six to twelve.

Juvenile proceedings were to be heard by a specially designated judge at a special session devoted exclusively to juvenile matters and from which all unnecessary persons were excluded. Special records of the court were to be maintained. Complaints and parties were brought before the court by flexible methods, namely by verified petition, which could be upon information and belief, and by citation.

Probation officers, to serve without pay, were made appointable by the judge of the juvenile court.

Delinquent and dependent children were defined, such definitions being practically the same as are at present in use. It was provided that whenever a minor should be committed by the Court to any individual, society or institution, a guardianship thereby arose with its attendant rights and obligations. The court was given authority to sanction adoptions. Power to commit delinquent or dependent children was bestowed upon the court. Institutions and homes to which commitment might be made were defined, and the right given to keep the proceedings open and to continue them from time to time as the exigencies of the case should warrant or demand. The court, however, could make no commitment extending beyond the majority of the minor involved.

The court was authorized to remand any minor who had committed a misdemeanor or felony, and found by the court to be incorrigible and incapable of reformation, or a public menace, to the proper court for regular criminal prosecution as though such minor were above the juvenile age of sixteen.

Provision was made for transferring offending minors to the juvenile court when first taken before a justice of the peace or police magistrate, such transfer to operate the same as though the minor had been brought before the juvenile court upon petition.

The act further provided that no minor under twelve years of age should be committed to jail under any circumstances, and that parents or others having lawful custody of dependent or neglected children could by agreement with any suitable person, institution or home, surrender such child for keeping or adoption without further legal action and that there should be county boards of visitors consisting of six members serving gratis to inspect and report upon all institutions, societies and homes receiving children under the provisions of the juvenile act.

The right was given the judge of the juvenile court to require information of any association receiving or desiring to receive children under the provisions of the juvenile law and the judge was forbidden to make any commitments to institutions he should deem unsatisfactory.

This act, finally, provided for a liberal construction of its terms and that the criminal and other laws of the state should not be affected except such parts thereof as were in conflict with the provisions of the act concerning jurisdiction over minors.

*c.—Act of 1907.*

Certain changes and additions to the juvenile laws were made by the 1907 act. The jurisdictional age limit of the court was raised to eighteen years, at which age it remains today for the purpose of assuming jurisdiction.

The county courts, except in counties of more than 100,000 inhabitants, were given jurisdiction over juvenile matters. In the latter type of counties the circuit courts retained their jurisdiction.

The salary of the circuit judge, in counties of over 100,000 inhabitants, designated to handle juvenile cases was increased \$50.00 per month over and above his regular salary to compensate him for the additional work assumed in handling such matters.

Probation officers in counties of less than 100,000 inhabitants still received no salary under this act, but in counties of over 100,000 population they were given salaries of not to exceed \$150.00 per month for chief probation officer and \$100.00 per month for deputy probation officers. Furthermore, the juvenile court in this latter type of county was authorized to provide and maintain a suitable detention home for the care and keeping of children ordered restrained by the court, to appoint a master and matron of such home to be paid salaries not to exceed \$125.00 per month for the master and \$50.00 per month for the matron, to appoint a clerk of said court at a salary not in excess of \$85.00 per month, and the court was authorized to expend not to exceed \$50.00 per month for certain necessary expenses such as transportation of minors appearing before it or committed by it, searching for relatives and similar matters.

Provision was made that the district attorney in such counties, namely with over 100,000 inhabitants, should appoint a deputy district attorney satisfactory to the judge of the juvenile court which deputy's duties should be to prosecute cases arising under the juvenile court act and further, with the consent of the district attorney, to prosecute all cases involving the person, rights or welfare of any minor under the age of eighteen years. Such deputy district attorney was provided with a salary of not to exceed \$100.00 per month.

The age below which children could not be committed to jail was increased from twelve to fourteen years, at which age it remains today.

Another provision appearing in this act for the first time permitted the court to require the parents, or either of them, of any neglected, dependent or delinquent child appearing before it, to appear and disclose the extent of their ability to contribute to its support. In case ability to support the child is disclosed, the court is empowered to enter such order or decree as shall be equitable and to enforce the same by

execution or any other method by which a court of equity may enforce its decrees or orders. All property of the parents so in default is made subject to execution with all statutory exemptions being annulled for this purpose.

*d.—Act of 1913.*

Several amendments to the juvenile act were enacted in 1913 which related chiefly to increasing the working personnel of the court, probation officers and institutional workers in counties of over 100,000 inhabitants. Two departments of the juvenile courts in such counties were established, one for boys and one for girls, each headed respectively by a man and a woman officer receiving a salary of not to exceed \$150.00 per month. An additional assistant probation officer was provided for at a salary of not to exceed \$150.00 per month, with a number of deputies, not to exceed six, at salaries of \$100.00 maximum. The court was also empowered in those counties to appoint a male and female night assistant for the detention home provided for in the 1907 act at a maximum salary of \$50.00 each and also a watchman at a salary not in excess of \$90.00 per month. Such new officers were given the powers and duties of probation officers. Provision was also made for appointment by the court of an assistant court clerk at a salary not in excess of \$100.00 per month. The court's budget for necessary expenses, such as transportation of minors and similar needs, was increased from \$50.00 to \$150.00 per month.

Provision by amendment was made whereby temporary orders relative to delinquents and dependents could be made by the court under a discretion of the court as to whether they should later be made permanent, and that court findings could be kept on separate cards subject to destruction or to permanent entry in the regular and permanent records of the court as the court should deem proper, thus making possible the handling of juvenile matters without the necessity of leaving a court record quasi-criminal in nature later to plague a person who had once been before the juvenile court.

As to institutions receiving children under the provisions of the juvenile laws and which received state aid, provision was made whereby, if any such institution refused to receive a child committed to it without just cause, and complaint of such action were made to the Secretary of State, further state aid should be withheld until the institution should purge itself of its dereliction.

*e.—Act of 1915.*

This act abolished the juvenile court as a phase of the circuit court in counties of over 100,000 population, and provided that county courts should have original jurisdiction of all juvenile matters. This was a decided backward step, its only excuse for enactment being to combine the duties of the juvenile court and domestic relations court.

*f.—Act of 1919.*

In 1919, in recognition of the principle that all cases involving family problems should be centralized under the jurisdiction of a non-criminal court of flexible procedure, the Court of Domestic Relations for Multnomah County was established. This court was given original and exclusive jurisdiction of all cases involving children under eighteen years of age coming within the purview of the juvenile court laws,

and over all cases of contributing to the delinquency of minors. This Act made the first step toward recognizing a standard for probation officers in that provision was made for approval of their appointment by the State Child Welfare Commission.

This act increased the jurisdiction of the Court of Domestic Relations so as to give it concurrent jurisdiction with the circuit court in all cases of wilful failure or refusal to support a wife or child. This remains the law today. The Department of Domestic Relations does not have at the present time exclusive jurisdiction of this type of case, although it touches vitally upon the family sphere which this informal court was intended to embrace within its jurisdiction.

Furthermore, this act made provision for jury trials in all criminal cases arising under the juvenile court laws upon demand of the accused or upon motion of the judge in his discretion. Such jury is to consist of twelve jurors and is to have the qualifications of a circuit court jury.

Provision was likewise made for compensation of probation officers for all actual expenses incurred in the performance of their duties. Ex-officio probation officers appointable in the discretion of the court in counties of more than 200,000 population, to serve without pay, were provided for. The superintendent and assistants of the women's protective division of the department of public safety, the attendance officers and assistants of the public schools and other volunteers satisfactory to the court who are willing to serve gratis, are eligible for appointment.

This act also provided for appeals in all criminal cases arising under the juvenile court act, such appeals being to the circuit court, where trial was had *de novo*, with right of final appeal to the Supreme Court.

A significant provision of this act was that which empowered the juvenile court to make full rules and regulations regarding the procedure and practice to be followed therein, thus permitting the most flexible, efficient, social and enlightened hearings and procedure to be used and doing away with technicalities and legal practice which would tend to create the atmosphere of a criminal trial; this latter being a most undesirable situation when dealing with juveniles.

The act made specific provision for temporary and permanent commitments and outlined the cases in which either type should be used, with guardianships required in all permanent commitments. Child-caring agencies, societies and institutions to which children could be committed were required to be duly incorporated according to state laws relative thereto before the court could make commitments thereto.

Provision was also made for a salary and the necessary expenses of the probation officer in counties of less than 100,000 population, which salary was to be fixed by the county court.

*g.—Act of 1929.*

The act of 1929 brings the law relating to the juvenile court to date as no measures relative thereto were passed by the 1931 legislature. By this act the Court of Domestic Relations for Multnomah County established by the 1919 Act was abolished. A new circuit judge was provided for who was to receive the regular circuit judge salary of \$6500.00. The new court

so created was to be known as the Department of Domestic Relations of the Circuit Court for Multnomah County, with the jurisdiction of the abolished Court of Domestic Relations transferred to it. Provision was made for separate records and all laws pertaining to the circuit courts of the state were made applicable to this new court. In addition, the jurisdiction of the Court was increased to embrace all uncontested divorce suits and all divorce suits wherein the parties have a child or children under the age of eighteen years. Only when the Department of Domestic Relations is congested with business or the judge thereof unable to sit may the presiding judge of the Circuit Court assign such divorce proceedings to some other department of the court. Such power of assignment applies only to divorce proceedings and not to other matters over which the juvenile court has original jurisdiction. Appeals from decisions or orders of this court are taken directly to the Supreme Court.

## 2.—FEDERAL LAWS REGARDING JUVENILE CASES.

### a.—In General.

Those juveniles who have violated federal laws do not come automatically under the purview of the state juvenile court law. The federal courts and laws do not recognize child cases as individual types and this has resulted in a very serious problem. The federal government has, however, in its administrative branch recognized and carefully studied this question. Through the White House conference on child health and protection and The Child Bureau of the Department of Labor, the most enlightened standards for juvenile work have been set for state use. These have developed upon the assumption that care is a question for communities to settle and is not one for federal courts to consider. Therefore it has been the practice of federal courts to turn juveniles who are delinquent as to federal laws over to the state juvenile courts for handling.

### b.—Applicable To Oregon

The federal court of the District of Oregon has cooperated with the juvenile courts of this state. As a whole, the federal court refers all cases of this type to the juvenile court. The federal court only acts on those cases of criminality inclined delinquent children for whom probation is useless, which cases, if occurring in the state courts, would result in being turned back for criminal trials there.

### c.—Recommendations.

Your committee recommends the following as to action by local federal courts:

1. Referring of all federal juvenile cases to the local juvenile court for handling and probation.
2. All expenses of such reference and probation to be paid the state by the federal government.
3. Education of federal officials as to the purpose for and the need of differentiation between juvenile and adult cases.
4. Conformity of juvenile handling as to detention to the local court.

## 3.—JURISDICTION AS TO TYPES OF JUVENILE MISBEHAVIOR.

### a.—In General.

The Oregon juvenile court laws give the

juvenile court exclusive jurisdiction over dependent, neglected and delinquent children.

### b.—Dependent Children.

Dependent children are defined by the Oregon law as those children who are:

1. Under the age of 18 and are:—
  - a. destitute, homeless or abandoned,
  - b. dependent upon the public for support,
  - c. without parental care or guardianship,
  - d. found begging or gathering alms,
  - e. found living with any vicious or disreputable person, or
  - f. in homes unfit for them because of depravity or drunkenness of the parents.
2. Under the age of 14 years and are:—
  - a. found peddling or selling any article except with court permit,
  - b. found playing musical instruments on streets for alms, or
  - c. accompanying a person who is begging.

### c.—Neglected Children.

Neglected children are defined by the Oregon law as those children under the age of 18 years who are:

1. neglected or wilfully unprovided for by parents or guardians,
2. allowed to have vicious associates,
3. allowed to visit vicious places, or
4. not properly controlled by parental discipline.

### d.—Delinquent Children.

Delinquent children are defined by the Oregon law as those children under the age of 18 years who are:

1. found violating a law of the state or city ordinance,
2. persistently disobedient to family control,
3. persistently truant from school,
4. associating with criminals or reputed criminals,
5. growing up in idleness or crime,
6. found in any disorderly house, bawdyhouse or house of ill fame,
7. guilty of immoral conduct, or
8. caught visiting or patronizing any gaming house.

## 4.—RECOMMENDED CHANGES IN THE JUVENILE COURT LAW.

### a.—In General.

A careful study of the statutory law relating to the juvenile courts of this state and more particularly to the Department of Domestic Relations of the circuit court for Multnomah County has convinced this committee that as the law stands at present very little improvement could be made therein. In only one instance is imperative need of legislative correction disclosed.

### b.—Return of Exclusive Juvenile Jurisdiction to Court

Notwithstanding the provisions of our statutes that the juvenile court shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction in all matters coming within the terms of this act, and notwithstanding a provision contained in the act stating that "Nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal any portion of the criminal law of this state, nor of any law concerning or affecting minors, except such portions thereof as are in conflict with the provisions of this act concerning the jurisdiction of the courts of this state over the children coming within the meaning of this act, and all such portions thereof are hereby repealed," the Supreme Court in *Ex parte Loundagin*, 129 Or. 652 held that the circuit court had jurisdiction, in the absence of a statute placing such jurisdiction in some other court, of every offense committed and triable within the county; that the circuit court thus had jurisdiction of an offense and of the person of a minor when said offense was so committed and triable within the county; and that such minor did not have to be brought



first before the juvenile court and there given a hearing. The juvenile law gives original and exclusive jurisdiction to the juvenile court, among other things, of all proceedings concerning delinquent children and a delinquent child is defined as one under eighteen years of age who has violated any law of the state. The supreme court evidently failed to find any "conflict" between the sections giving jurisdiction to the juvenile courts and the laws applicable to the circuit courts of the various counties.

The result reached in the Loundagin case is directly opposed to the intent and purpose and, as this committee firmly believes, to the express wording of our juvenile laws, and calls for legislative amendment of said laws in order that, in all cases in which a minor is accused of having committed an offense against our laws, the juvenile court shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction. A highly proper provision of the juvenile laws permits the judge of the juvenile court either before or after a hearing, to remand said minor to the proper county court, in a proper case and when circumstances demand such action, for the regular criminal proceedings and sentence.

*c.—Creation of Exclusive Jurisdiction of Adult Cases Involving Children.*

In order that the best interests of the children involved in bastardy, non-support and desertion cases and cases of contributing to the delinquency of minors may be best subserved, this committee believes and therefore recommends that exclusive jurisdiction thereof, in judicial districts comprising one county and having over 100,000 population, be given the Department of Domestic Relations. The more intimate contact with children and the fuller comprehension and understanding of their problems and what is best for their welfare, as well as a greater knowledge of home and family problems, peculiarly qualifies the judge of this department to deal intelligently with these four types of cases. At present the department is given exclusive jurisdiction of cases of contributing to the delinquency of minors and concurrent jurisdiction with the circuit court of non-support and desertion cases. In practice, however, cases of contributing to the delinquency of minors are regularly tried in some other department of the circuit court in this jurisdiction. The Department of Domestic Relations has no express jurisdiction of bastardy cases. The statute defining and punishing non-support and desertion as a felony is all that could be desired.

*d.—Change In Juvenile Public Entertainment Law.*

At present it is provided by law that no minor under the age of sixteen years shall participate in any public entertainment where an admission fee is charged except with the written permission of the judge of the juvenile court, failure to secure such permission rendering the child a dependent. No punishment or penalty is imposed upon the theatre owner or manager or the parents or others responsible for the child's welfare. Thus the law is entirely ineffective. This committee recommends legislation making such employment, or aiding, assisting or abetting such employment or use of minors, a misdemeanor and suggests as a penalty for infractions thereof the punishment now employed in the cigarette law, i. e. a fine of not to

exceed \$100.00 for the first offense; of \$25.00 to \$500.00 for the second offense, or a jail sentence not to exceed thirty days, or both; and for a third or subsequent offense a mandatory jail sentence of not exceeding thirty days and fine of \$25.00 to \$500.00. This subject does not now, and this committee sees no compelling reason why it should come within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. This committee, however, has had this matter called to its attention as one in which the morals, character and welfare of minors are frequently seriously endangered and as a situation with which, in the present state of the law, the courts are powerless to cope, and therefore it recommends such remedial legislation.

*e.—Privileged Proceedings As To Juneniles.*

In order to protect fully the informality of hearing in the juvenile court and insure the greatest possibility of procuring the fullest disclosure of facts by the minor involved, this committee deems it both wise and expedient and therefore recommends that legislation be enacted providing that the disposition of a child by the juvenile court, or any evidence given in a juvenile court hearing or proceeding, shall be unlawful and incompetent evidence against such child in any civil, criminal or other cause or proceedings in any other court of the state.

**B.—PERSONNEL OF JUVENILE COURT.**

**1.—JUDGE.**

*a.—Qualification of Incumbent.*

The judge of the juvenile court of Multnomah County, under the present Oregon law, is a circuit judge of the state and is vested, along with the other circuit judges, with the highest original jurisdiction of the state. His salary is fixed at \$6500.00 a year of which \$6000.00 is paid by the state and \$500.00 by Multnomah County; his term is for six years.

Judge Clarence H. Gilbert is the present juvenile court judge in Multnomah County as well as being judge of the Court of Domestic Relations and circuit court judge. He was appointed by Governor Patterson to the position of judge of the Court of Domestic Relations, the old County Court, in December, 1928. Seeing the failure of the court to conform to modern standards, he requested aid of the National Probation Association. They sent Marjorie Bell, one of their field secretaries, to investigate and report, which investigation was started on October 1, 1929, and resulted in the survey report being published in 1930 in which a clear working program was outlined for use in this county. After careful investigation, the committee feels that Judge Gilbert has worked admirably in hewing to the line set in the report and also in the "Juvenile Court Standards" as set out by the federal Department of Labor. The present circuit court position was established by the 1929 legislature and Judge Gilbert was elected by the people for term expiring in 1936.

As to the fitness of Judge Gilbert, the committee wishes to confirm the opinion of Mrs. Bell which is quoted from her report:

"The juvenile court has in Judge Gilbert a man who meets the requirements which we have briefly stated in the discussion of standards. He was appointed by Governor Patterson to fill the unexpired term of a judge who was recalled, and since his appointment has taken many forward steps for the progress and growth of the court. He has clear insight into social problems involving children

and their welfare, and a sound grasp of the principles and theory of social treatment for those problems. His work merits the support of the community in any plans which he may have for the care of children coming into the court."

Judge Gilbert assumed his work at a very critical time in the history of the court in that the court had been subjected to a great deal of adverse criticism which was as a result damaging to the court's morale and its standing in the community. Your committee has only commendation for the work performed since his entrance into the Multnomah County court.

*b.—Recommendation As To the State.*

Recognizing the fact that this report was asked to cover only Multnomah County, your committee is taking it upon itself to call to the attention of its readers that there are certain localities within this state in which much improvement may be made. The fact that the juvenile court in those localities has failed to maintain exclusive jurisdiction over children who are delinquent is proof of this point. It is therefore recommended that certain educational work must be carried on in order to bring the state as a whole up to the standards of good juvenile court work. The study of the proper handling of juveniles is a tremendous one for any one man no matter what his genius or ability is and so your committee strongly recommends that a state-wide educational program be carried on among the judges involved in this type of case and that regular meetings be held in which nationally known authorities on child welfare work may be called upon for addresses so as to inculcate within the courts of this state a knowledge of the child problem which will aid them in better solving the problems arising in their own districts.

**2.—PROBATION OFFICERS.**

*a.—Standards Set For Work.*

The probationary staff of the juvenile court under the Oregon law is primarily charged with the supervision, development and improvement of delinquent and dependent children. The fundamental principles underlying the best standards for this line of probationary work have been outlined as follows:

- "1. That the court dealing with children should be clothed with broad jurisdiction, embracing all classes of cases in which a child is in need of the protection of the State;
2. That the court shall have a scientific understanding of each child;
3. That treatment should be adapted to individual needs; and
4. That there should be a presumption in favor of keeping the child in his own home and his own community, except when adequate investigation shows this not to be in the best interest of the child."

—*Juvenile Court Standards, Children's Bureau, Washington, D. C.*

In 1923 the National Probation Association assembled a committee of leading juvenile court authorities of the country for the purpose of formulating a standard juvenile court law. In that law the underlying principle is stated as follows:

"The purpose of this act is to secure for each child under its jurisdiction such care, guidance and control, preferably in his own home, as will conduce to the child's welfare and the best interests of the state; and when such child is removed from his own family, to secure for him custody, care and discipline as nearly as possible equivalent to that which should have been given by his parents."

The primary aim in each case being, if possible, to keep a child in its own home, it will be recognized at once that the work of a probationary

staff of the juvenile court is not limited merely to the supervision of children; on the contrary, the principal job of the court is to reconstruct the family itself in the interest of the child so that, if possible, the child may remain in its own home.

*b.—Personnel of Organization.*

The organization of the probationary staff of the Portland juvenile court is as follows:

Mrs. Elizabeth Neth, chief probation officer and supervisor of the boys' department; Mrs. Kate H. Maguire, assistant chief probation officer and supervisor of the girls' department (at present on a six months leave of absence); the following probation officers for the girls' department: Mrs. Genevieve J. Forsythe, assigned to the west side district; Mrs. Vera H. McCord, assigned to the northeast district; Mrs. Dora A. Danforth, assigned to the southeast district; and Miss Elda Russell, assigned to the central east side district. The probation officers working in the boys' department are: Mr. George J. Clauss, assigned to the central east side district; Mr. George W. Myers, assigned to the west side and inter-city district; Mr. Lot P. Keeler, assigned to the northeast district; and Mr. O. C. Bortzmeyer, assigned to the southeast district.

The women members of the staff are both trained and experienced in social work. It has been heretofore almost impossible to secure trained or experienced men social workers. Only one man on the probationary staff, Mr. Clauss, had either training or experience before becoming a member of the court's staff. This condition is due to the extremely limited material available and also to the low salaries paid. This renders it highly desirable to have a supervisor for the men who is trained and experienced in social work so that the men may receive their training after they join the staff. The men are getting most competent supervision and training under the present chief probation officer, Mrs. Elizabeth Neth, and with effective results. Mrs. Neth is not only efficient as a social worker but has ability as an executive.

*c.—Case Load On Officers.*

During the year 1931 there were 7,051 active cases handled by the seven field workers. This makes the average case load of each worker 84 cases. H. H. Lou, the outstanding authority on juvenile court work, and also the Children's Bureau, of Washington, D. C., recommend a maximum case load of 50 cases per worker. From the results accomplished in this court, it would therefore appear that the local staff is either exceedingly efficient or overworked. In support of the former supposition, Judge Carl B. Hyatt, consultant for the Children's Bureau of the Federal Department of Labor, in a recent survey of juvenile court conditions in Portland, is authority for the statement that few cities if any in the country have a better organization than our local court. Of the 7,051 active cases handled in 1931, there were only 376 which were actually brought in for court action. The probation officers themselves were able to make a settlement or adjustment in all other cases.

*d.—Miscellaneous Data.*

The Portland court, unlike some others, does not encourage irregular or volunteer probation officers. Something may be said for volunteer officers, with their enthusiasm and leisure for such work, but it has become generally recognized by the best authorities that effective probation service means regular paid service.

The Portland officers are selected under civil service regulations, with competitive examinations for vacancies. Probation officers are employed by the Portland court only after their demonstrated ability to render effective service.



The necessary qualifications of one year's previous residence in Multnomah County is sometimes a handicap in selection, several promising candidates having in the past been disqualified from examinations because of this restriction.

Probation officers in Portland may be removed from office for inefficiency after a hearing before the Civil Service Board, at the request of the judge of the court. While in several cases the personnel of the local staff might be improved, the judge has not as yet deemed it wise to take such a step, probably being deterred by reason of the fact that a public hearing would be involved in making such change.

All except two of the officers are college graduates, and, excepting three of the men, have had training in social service.

The salaries paid the Portland workers are somewhat, but not greatly, below those in effect in other cities of comparable size. The officers own their own cars, an allowance of \$20.00 per month being made for their operation in connection with their duties. This allowance has been inadequate, but there is little probability of its being increased, in the present state of public finance.

Girls' cases coming to the attention of the court are always assigned to women probation officers. Cases of boys under 12 years of age are also assigned to women officers. But all cases of boys 12 years of age and over are assigned to men.

A definite plan for constructive work is made and recorded in each case. These records are added to concurrently as the work on each case progresses.

In most cases home visits should be made by the probation officer every two weeks, in order to accomplish effective supervision. Such visits acquaint the probation officer with the assets and liabilities of the family and give opportunity for the correction of unfavorable home conditions. In many cases these visits should be made oftener than once in two weeks. With an under-staffed court it is, of course, impossible to give the supervision requisite for the accomplishment of the best results.

Reconstructive work with the family is always undertaken whenever necessary, in the interest of the child. Whenever possible the services of other agencies are enlisted in doing necessary family case work.

The probation officers assist and guide children of working age in the choice of their vocations; planning for the spare time and filling such time with a reasonable amount of work and play is one of the most important parts of a probation officer's functions.

#### e.—Recommendations.

There is only one practicable improvement which might be suggested at this time in connection with the local probation officers. This would be a somewhat higher standard of personnel, with replacement, if necessary, in two or three cases, with better qualified workers, and by the employment of two additional competent and efficient workers.

The need of additional help in the class of work may be shown by the fact that the Department of Domestic Relations disposes of from twelve to fifteen hundred divorce cases annually. There are from five hundred to seven hundred and fifty children affected every year by these divorces. The court is without the requisite staff

for doing any social work in these broken homes. When we consider that the broken home is one of the principal causes of delinquency among children, the importance is seen at once of having adequate social work done during the breakup period. Many of these homes could doubtless be salvaged, and any children suffering from neglect or abuse, or found to be in an environment likely to produce delinquency, could be given attention by the staff of the court or proper community agencies at once.

#### C.—PROCEDURE.

##### 1.—SOURCE OF COMPLAINT

Juvenile dependents and delinquents are usually brought before the attention of the court by one of three methods:

1. *The Police Department.*—This is at present a very fertile means of discovery of dependency and delinquency conditions among children. The patrolman soon begins to know his district and is best able to judge the need of aid to the dependent and delinquent child. Practically all the delinquent cases are found by the police. A few years ago the police department was lax in handling juvenile and adult cases separately and as late as 1929 instances were found in which children were placed over night in common wards with drunkards and vagabonds to await delivery the following day to the juvenile authorities. This harmful practice has decreased of late although improvement should be shown in this respect.

2.—*The attendance officer of the public schools.*—This source has been falling off of late due to the excellent manner and co-operation of this official with the juvenile court in handling his own problems. The officer in charge of this work, Mr. Charles Fowler Jr., is highly trained and is a specialist in this type of work. The results of this are constantly showing themselves.

3.—*Complaints filed with the probation officer or the court clerk.*—This type of introduction includes reports by child welfare groups and individuals such as the dependent's and delinquent's neighbors who have discovered cases needing the work of the court.

##### 2.—DETENTION.

###### a.—In General.

It is necessary for every juvenile court to make provisions in proper cases for the detention of children, particularly delinquents, while awaiting hearing. This may be done by providing a detention home, as is done in Portland, such home being under the direct control of the court, or it may be done by providing for necessary detention in boarding homes, as is successfully done in Boston.

Detention should be limited to children for whom it is absolutely necessary, such as children whose home conditions make immediate removal necessary, children who are beyond the control of their parents or guardians, runaways, and those whose parents cannot be relied upon to produce them in court, children who have committed offenses so serious that their release pending the disposition of their cases would endanger public safety, and children who must be held as witnesses. In cases not covered by the foregoing, children may be properly left, pending hearing, with their parents or other custodian, and this is the policy followed by the Portland court.

*b.—Portland's Detention Home For Juveniles.*

The Frazer Detention Home, which is used by the local court for detention purposes, was built about 25 years ago. It is located upon about four acres of ground at 52nd and Hassalo Streets. The ground was supplied by Dr. S. A. Brown, a citizen of Portland, to be used for that purpose alone. In case the home is abandoned, the land will revert to Dr. Brown.

The building is a frame structure, with a capacity of about sixty children. The equipment is antiquated and the facilities inadequate for proper segregation. There is no sick room. There is not a sufficient number of isolation rooms. The building is constructed entirely of wood and, as it stands, is a fire trap.

For many years the Frazer Home was used to house both delinquent and dependent children of both sexes, with both types attending the same school and using the same playground and dining room. During the past three years the court has accomplished segregation by first of all eliminating all dependent children from the institution, and further segregation was accomplished about the first of January, 1932, by eliminating delinquent girls from the institution. The Frazer Home is now used exclusively for delinquent boys.

The cost of operating the Home during 1931 was approximately \$11,000. The per capita daily population of the Home was 23 children, and the monthly per capita cost of housing children in that institution was \$55.00. The average daily population since 1931 is 17, making the monthly per capita cost \$65.00.

*c.—Recommendations.*

The matter of detention is perhaps the most serious immediate problem confronting the Portland court. If the court continues the use of a detention home, a new one should be provided. However, the court now has under advisement the matter of placing detained children in foster homes, as has been successfully done in Boston.

Should a decision be made to continue the detention home, the present ground space is adequate for a modern plant. There is a portable school building on the grounds, which is a frame structure, and School District No. 1 provides two teachers. Besides the two teachers, the Home has a staff of six persons. Should the detention home be abandoned and the boarding home method resorted to for detention, this staff would be dispensed with but the court would require two workers in addition to its regular staff. The boarding home plan, with two added workers, could doubtless be used at considerably less cost than is required to maintain the detention home.

**3.—MEDICAL AND PSYCHIATRIC CARE.**

*a.—Medical Services Rendered.*

The children's department of the Public Welfare Bureau came into existence January 1, 1930. It has charge of dependent children and those detached from their homes but not the delinquent children. Children over which it has jurisdiction range in age from birth to 21 years. At the present time this Bureau has 439 active cases from 183 families under its care with only two persons to carry on this work—Mrs. Esther Kelly Watson and Mrs. Margaret Carter. During the three years they have handled 861 families, 678 of which are now in the inactive group.

Under the present arrangement all children who are accepted for care by the children's department of the Public Welfare Bureau or the Court of Domestic Relations are given a cursory examination before being placed for care.

Dr. Myra Brown Tynan, of the city Bureau of Health, or Dr. Dora Underwood, examine the girls, while the county physician examines the boys. These examinations include nose and throat culture and skin examination for contagious diseases. In cases where dependent and delinquent girls have been subjected to a bad moral condition, the doctor makes a vaginal smear. In case of delinquent girls, after the Court of Domestic Relations has taken over jurisdiction, the doctor takes Wassermann and vaginal smears, should it appear advisable. Dr. Dora Underwood makes the examination in the cases of girls on which testimony is required in court. Any further examinations are taken care of by the Medical School clinic after the children have been placed for care. Because of the lack of facilities and because there are no public health classes conducted at the Medical School at the present time, the Medical School clinic does not make general health examinations in cases which do not present pathological symptoms. There is likewise no provision for dental examinations and follow-up work.

*b.—Reasons For Attention.*

Without an understanding of the child's physical condition, it is impossible to correct remediable physical difficulties or to place it with sufficient intelligence to enable the boarding mother to provide special care for it. Since physical conditions are often the cause of behavior difficulties, a knowledge of these conditions will assist in the proper adjustment of the child and the overcoming of such difficulties.

Lou in his "Juvenile Courts in the United States" emphasizes two important things in connection with physical and mental examinations:

**NEED OF SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF THE CHILD.**

"All the facts that a social investigator can ascertain about the child's surroundings reveal only a part of the child's history. In order to study the child as a whole and to know the human material with which the court deals and the real causes of delinquency, the child himself—his physical condition, his mental life, and his personality—must be studied by a competent physician, psychologist, and psychiatrist. Mental and physical defectiveness next to defective environment, is generally recognized as the greatest cause of delinquency. It has been estimated that more than one-half of the children that pass through the juvenile court show physical and mental disabilities that are fundamental factors in the delinquent's conduct, and only the expert physician, psychologist and psychiatrist can fully appreciate these. A scientific understanding of each child is absolutely necessary, if treatment is to be adapted to individual needs. No juvenile court at present deems itself well-equipped without medical, psychological and psychiatric service available in all cases."

**PHYSICAL EXAMINATIONS.**

"Value of physical examinations. Physical disorders are responsible, at least indirectly, for a part of the delinquent's personality and behavior characteristics. Every physical defect—pathological growth of adenoids and tonsils, chronic infection of ears or teeth, to name only a few of the commonest ailments and defects of children—is more or less a source of nervous irritation and, consequently, of restlessness and possibly of a feeling of inferiority. Though none of these localized ailments and defects directly produce delinquency, they can readily bring about states of general ill-health and may be indirect causes of delinquency. There are many physical ailments and defects which may be conceived of as needing treatment in the delinquent child, but mainly from the standpoint of offering the best possible basis for reformation, and not because such ailments are direct causes of

delinquency. Physical exuberance, such as physical overdevelopment, superabundant energy, and pre-mature sex development, may also be a cause of delinquency, but it is difficult to ascertain positively the direct cause in any given case. Physical examinations of children before the courts frequently disclose conditions of physical disease, physical defects or physical ill-health, the improvement of which may result, as told in numerous "juvenile court stories", in the removal of important contributing causes of delinquency."

*c.—Portland's Need For This Attention.*

The cost of caring for the children, whose support is born by the community—about 450 inactive cases and 439 active cases—is immeasurably increased by the extended care that is necessary for lack of adequate physical examinations and consequent recommendations. The amount expended by Multnomah County on dependent and delinquent children is approximately \$20,000.00 per year, exclusive of the cost of temporary detention of delinquent children.

*d.—Recommendations.*

Judge Gilbert has suggested to the county commissioners that the county fund of \$1,000.00 allowed this court for mental testing be transferred to the University of Oregon Child Guidance Clinic. In return they will give our children mental tests plus physical and psychiatric examinations and treatment. This clinic is under the direction of Dr. H. H. Dixon, psychiatrist. Dr. Lewis Martin, of Reed College, is the psychologist, and Miss Gladys Ball, visiting teacher director, is the psychiatric social worker. The following services are rendered by the clinic to the court:

1. Thorough physical examinations are given children.

2. Psycho-metric tests, which are the measurements of intelligence, are made, and information, and attention paid to the special abilities and disabilities of each child. Thus, all children upon whom feeble-minded commitments have been filed, will be referred to the clinic for psychological and physical examinations. The recommendation of the staff of the clinic will be considered in making commitments to the feeble-minded institutions.

3. Psychiatric examinations and treatments will be given to all children referred by the court who have such severe personality difficulties that the usual efforts of the court officer are not effective in properly adjusting this child in his home and community.

The officers of the court will supply the clinic with information as to social background of each child referred and carry on the treatment recommended by the clinic.

Your committee feels that this transfer of \$1,000.00 to the University of Oregon Child Guidance Clinic should be made. Although greatly inadequate this will be a step forward in the treatment of our subnormal and feeble-minded children. But what shall we do for the children who do not fall in these groups? The more intelligent constitute the greatest number, consequently cost the most to support, and contain more individuals who are capable of becoming constructive citizens.

It is generally recognized that proper care of a normal child requires a thorough physical examination semi-annually including a tuberculin (we do that much for our cows), urinalysis, dental examination and posture grading. Once a year in addition the hearing and eyesight should be tested and a blood examination made. Each child should be protected against

diphtheria, smallpox and special tests should be made as indicated in each case.

We recommend the adoption of a physical examination record form similar to that issued by the Child Welfare League of America (samples attached to original report). If the University of Oregon Medical School Clinic is not equipped to give these examinations and, if such a department cannot be arranged for with them, we recommend that an attempt be made to secure a properly trained pediatricist to supervise a special clinic where these children can be regularly examined every six months and that adequate and prompt reports from such clinic, including diagnosis and recommendations, be made to the referring agency. We believe that such a procedure will change physical examinations from a negative (pathologic study only) to a positive influence upon the life of the individual.

Most children will respond happily to the scientific interest shown in their diet and general physical welfare by trying to correct and improve slight imperfections such as posture, flat feet, etc. The appetite and choice of foods improve along with other health habits. The disposition often changes under such supervision. The doctor's kindly influence stimulates the child and often improves the home in which he lives. We believe that such supervision will give the child a brighter future outlook.

**4.—HEARINGS.**

*a.—Standards Set For Hearings.*

The *Juvenile Court Standards* summarizes the proper procedure of hearings as follows:

1. Hearings should be held within 48 hours,
2. No publicity,
3. Parents should be present,
4. Conducted informally,
5. Nothing done or implied so as to indicate a criminal nature,
6. Written reports to be private for court use only,
7. Child and parents informed as to its nature,
8. No jury trials allowed,
9. Child not present at dependency hearings.

The Multnomah County juvenile court is using these standards as a model to which it is fashioning its conduct.

*b.—Recommendations.*

As the case load per officer is high in Portland, some delay is caused by the study of the nature and history of the cases. This requires time upon the part of the probation officers to visit the parents, friends, teachers and associates of the children to gain proper understandings of the different situations.

Judge Gilbert is of the opinion that newspaper reporters should not be barred from the hearings, although he does require their word that no child's name be used in print and no inference be cast which would endanger that child's reputation in the community. In this the committee does not fully agree. It is true that if the reporters covering the court are in perfect accord with the principles of juvenile case work and are not primarily interested in news or scandal-finding work, their admittance would not be prejudicial. However, their absence would prevent such unfortunate, unjustifiable and damaging attacks as one of the Portland papers recently made upon the court. Any investigation or study of the court should be made by reliable and capable citizens, and not as a publicity stunt. There is too much involved in the building of the future of our citizens to permit such procedure.

The court requires the presence of the parents at the hearings and conducts such hearings in an informal manner. The fact that out of 1531 cases arising in 1931, only 363 were actually subjected to formal hearings, illustrates the court's efforts in this regard. These hearings are very informally held in that all the parties sit around a table in the court chambers with the judge. This causes the hearings to partake rather of a conference nature than of a criminal one.

The court reporter is always present at a major hearing. This gives the court a record for use in case of appeal or for rehearing and also offers a stand upon which the court may rely in case of criticism. Judge Gilbert assured the committee that under no circumstances is this testimony ever made public nor is it open as a public record. As long as the secrecy features are preserved and the record cannot be used as a future black mark against the child, the committee can see no objection to this procedure.

As to the use of jury trials, Judge Gilbert refuses the use of juries in any of the juvenile cases, either dependent or delinquent in nature. There is a question as to whether the court has the right to do this if a jury is demanded by the child, its parents or guardian. The law on this question is somewhat obscure. If there is any question as to this point, it is the committee's recommendation that legislative steps be taken to clarify the law. The very nature of the cases demand this protection for the child against untrained and unskilled jury tampering.

#### 5.—DISPOSITION OF CASE.

The court has several outlets available to it for the disposal of the case after hearing. The summary of the most important of these follows:

1.—*Dismissed or continued indefinitely.*—This corresponds to an acquittal in a criminal case.

2.—*Placed on probation.*—This is the usual method of handling the minor delinquent cases and many of the major ones. In this case the child is placed under the responsibility of a probation officer. The child's activities are guided and his daily life directed through intelligent control. It is here that the advantages of the juvenile court system must be realized. Probation is the chief cornerstone of the edifice and is created to build youth to solid citizenship in the future and not as a punishment for youthful missteps of the past.

3.—*Committed to institutions.*—If a child is ungovernable and the criminal tendencies developed beyond probational control or because of physical or mental incapacity or quirks, the child is incapable of direction while free under probation, it must be placed under institutional control. The Oregon Training School at Woodburn and like institutions are in your committee's opinion open to criticism at this time, but since it is beyond the scope of this report the committee recommends a careful study be made of them within the near future.

4.—*Fines and restitution.*—Fines are poor punishments for children. The reasons are too obvious for comment. There are cases, however, in which restitution may be used. The juvenile court is a building institution, primarily interested in child welfare. There are only a few children who are capable of learning by paying for the loss or damage they cause. If they do not learn by this method, it is useless as a corrective and other methods must be used to

reach the child's character and build upon it. Therefore, restitution's chief use is as an ancillary method to probation and is used principally in order to reimburse the victim for his loss.

#### D.—STATISTICAL DATA.

##### 1.—ACTUAL FIGURES.

The following statistical data was obtained from the court records:

##### DELINQUENT AND DEPENDENT CASES

1927 to 1932, inclusive

Year	DELINQUENT CASES			Dependent Cases
	Boys	Girls	Total	
1927.....	1371	114	1485	158
1928.....	1217	82	1299	137
1929.....	1372	141	1513	260
1930.....	1213	165	1378	329
1931.....	1054	130	1184	347
1932—(1st 6 mos.)..	441	53	494	126

##### CASES HANDLED IN 1930 AND 1931

	1930	1931
New.....	1212	1090
Old (Repeat Cases).....	495	441
Total.....	1707	1531
Source of Complaint:—		
Formal.....	706	363
Police Reports.....	658	785
Informal.....	343	383
Total.....	1707	1531
Type of Case:—		
Delinquent—New.....	798	707
Old.....	419	361
Total.....	1217	1068
Dependent—New.....	289	298
Old.....	40	49
Total.....	329	347
Curfew—		
New.....	62	35
Old.....	23	22
Total.....	85	57
Runaways—		
New.....	63	50
Old.....	13	9
Total.....	76	59
Total.....	1707	1531
Miscellaneous:—		
Adoptions.....	120	91
Change of name.....	5	12
Mental examinations.....	175	67

##### DELINQUENT CASES CLASSIFIED

	1930	1931
Assault and battery.....	15	10
Auto theft.....	76	72
Begging.....	1	1
Bicycle theft.....	140	115
Burglary.....	21	32
Curfew violation.....	85	57
Destroying property.....	34	18
Disorderliness.....	41	11
Disposing of stolen property.....	6	13
Firearms.....	11	19
Forgery.....	12	3
Gambling.....	14	14
Immorality and sex delinquency.....	72	50
Incorrigibility.....	109	103
Intoxication.....	22	18
Larceny.....	194	211
Malicious mischief.....	129	149
Obtaining goods under false pretenses.....	19	4
Pool hall.....	2	1
Receiving stolen property.....	3	6
Robbery.....	91	20
Runaways.....	76	59
Shoplifting.....	4	5
Smoking.....	20	10
Trespassing.....	45	103
Truancy.....	69	30
Vagrancy.....	35	22
Violation city ordinance.....	7	26
Violation traffic ordinance.....	26	27

Total Delinquent Cases.....	1378	1184
Dependents.....	329	347

Totals.....1707 1531

It will be noted that there is a substantial reduction in the total number of delinquent cases handled each year since 1929. It is also interesting to note that the number of repeaters

COMMITMENTS—STATE TRAINING SCHOOL  
FOR BOYS

Year	No. of Commitments
1927.....	25
1928.....	35
1929.....	14
1930.....	51
1931.....	24
1932—(First six months).....	5

coming before the court have steadily decreased since 1928, at which time more than 40% of the cases handled were repeat cases. As noted the old or repeat cases in 1930 and 1931 have decreased to a point of less than 30% even though the total cases handled each year have also decreased. The 'repeat case' is the gauge of court effectiveness. The first criminal act of any juvenile is to be charged against the parent or community and not the court. If, however, the court once gains supervision of the child, it is responsible to a degree at least for that child's future behavior. Thus the decrease of repeat cases is a basis of judging the court's effectiveness.

b.—*Recommendation.*

In addition to the present statistical records, your committee recommends that the court maintain a record of delinquent cases, by districts, and that the cases in each district be classified. These data should be helpful in each district, and should indicate the direction in which effort is required to effect a reduction in the number of delinquent cases.

## III.—CONCLUSIONS.

## A.—IN GENERAL.

Your committee has included its recommendations as to changes along with the detail of the report. It believes that such procedure will enable the reader better to understand the recommended changes. The appreciation of the modern trend of juvenile court work may best be understood only through a careful and analytical study. The efforts of the federal government, national associations of social and political leaders and state courts and governments to develop this new phase of jurisprudence may only be fully appreciated when the daily conduct of the court and the results thereof may be seen.

Your committee is of one opinion, that the work once commenced must be permitted to continue unfettered by unintelligent criticism and be protected by public knowledge of a work well started towards a field of development unthought of half a century ago. Certain cases, as handled by the court, are doubtless open to adverse comment but the mass of excellent results overshadow them.

Your committee also wishes to remark as to case histories of child delinquencies it had the opportunity to hear and observe. Anyone having such opportunity is immediately impressed by the fact that it is not the child's fault in most cases but the parents' instead. As has been suggested by some authorities, the name of the court should be changed from "Juvenile Court" to "Parental Court". It is wrong to make the child wear a shoe fashioned for its parents. The term "Juvenile Court" sets the wrong persons' teeth on edge.

## B.—THE COMMUNITY.

Those laws which rest upon education and morale building for their strength, require the

unqualified support and tireless efforts of the community for their effective operation. This co-operation requires more than mere knowledge of the needs upon the part of the community. It requires its action and its co-operation with the court, the schools, and the parents. National child welfare demands the efforts of each group.

The Multnomah County juvenile court has, at the present time, urged the formation of a council representing the major groups of the community interested in or working for child welfare and betterment, which council is to meet at regular periods to consider the policies of the Court and to advise, sanction or criticize them. In such capacity they would sit as a jury of policy and their strength would lie in the strength of the community which they would represent.

In this manner the community may be appraised of the work and plans of the court and in such manner as to be independent of the whims of the newspapers. This type of council has proved successful where it has been tried and its introduction here is meeting with deserved support.

The public schools in Portland have given excellent co-operation to the court. This is doubtless due to the fact that an able and trained social director is in charge of the disciplinary department of the schools. This director understands and endorses modern child handling procedure. It is the practice for the public schools to handle their own problems with the child direct except in those few cases where no control can be maintained by them over the child. This procedure has resulted in the lightening of the court load.

A number of the business and civic clubs of the city have given active aid to the court in working with the children and providing many with much needed recreational facilities and others with employment. A number of these club members and other public-minded citizens have also volunteered their services as parole officers for delinquent children and have served the court admirably in this particular. Your committee feels, however, that not enough work is being done in this respect and that success of the policy now started requires more effort by those fitted for this youth-directing work.

The community must be aroused to the importance of the work. Time and money spent in juvenile work is the proverbial "stitch in time". We must therefore be willing to spend "millions for defense" of coming citizens in guarding and guiding them in order to pay "not a cent for tribute" in connection with the waves of crime sweeping this country.

Respectfully submitted,

C. ULYSSES MOORE,  
DOUGLAS CROWLEY,  
ALFRED F. PARKER,  
JAMES P. FORSYTH, JR.,  
G. F. MACKENZIE,  
FRED B. MESSING,  
BURTON E. PALMER, *Chairman.*

Approved by Edmund Hayes, chairman of the Social Welfare Section.

Approved by Elmer R. Goudy, chairman of the Public Safety and Defense Section.

Accepted by the Board of Governors and ordered printed and submitted to the membership for consideration and action on December 30, 1932.